APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,244	05/10/2001	Gordon Good		4076

7590   04/16/2008

OPSWARE INC.
599 N. MATHILDA
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER
CALLAHAN, PAUL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/852,244	GOOD, GORDON
	Examiner	Art Unit
	PAUL CALLAHAN	2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14,16-18,20-22,24-31 and 33-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *15, 19, 23, 32* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-36 are pending and have been examined. This Office Action is directed

towards the Applicant's response filed January 7, 2008.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 1-28-2005 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

The applicant argues that the claimed invention may be distinguished from the

teachings of Rothermel '827 because the reference does not teach the feature of

establishing security policies at a central location and then creating a plurality of

templates reflecting said policies. The Examiner maintains that such is indeed taught

by Rothermel at, for example, col. 10 lines 8-11, and at col. 4 lines 35-60 where a

network administrator is taught as creating security policies at a central location to be

distributed to devices over a network using security templates.

The applicant argues that Rothermel fails to teach the feature of expansion of a

template "at a central location" and then providing the created document from the

central location to a plurality of computing devices. Yet a careful reading of Rothermel

shows that such is indeed taught at the passages cited, most particularly in col. 4 lines

35-60 and col. 5 lines 1-10.

The Applicant argues that Rothermel fails to teach the features of a resident

agent on the plurality of computing devices, and a communications gateway. However a

careful reading of Rothermel shows that these features are indeed taught at col. 5 lines
20-67.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a

foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year

prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1-14, 16-18, 20-22, 24-31, and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

as being clearly anticipated by Rothermel et al., US 6,678,827.

As for claim 1, Rothermel teaches a method for automatically provisioning a

plurality of computing devices in accordance with established policies (col. 4 lines 20-

67), the method comprising the steps of: creating a plurality of templates reflecting said

policies (col. 4 lines 20-67), expanding at least one template at a central location to

create a document comprising expanded information (col. 4 lines 20-67), and sending

from the central location the expanded document comprising the expanded information

to said plurality of computing devices (col.4 line 49 thru col.5 line 13).

As for claim 2, Rothermel teaches interpreting the expanded information by agents which are respectively resident on each of said plurality of computing devices (col.5 lines 32-35).

As for claims 3 and 9, Rothermel teaches the structure of said plurality of templates includes conditional statements that determine whether a template is to be expanded with predetermined information on the basis of the computing device to which the expanded information is being provided (col.4 lines 30-62., col.5 lines 60-67).

As for claims 4 and 10, Rothermel teaches the plurality of templates includes a first category of templates that reflect policies applicable to all of the plurality of computing devices (col.6 lines 20-32).

As for claims 5 and 11, Rothermel teaches at the plurality of templates includes a second category of templates that reflect policies applicable to only a subset of the plurality of computing devices (col.6 lines 20-32).

As for claims 6 and 12, Rothermel teaches the plurality of templates includes another category of templates that reflect policies only applicable to a particular type of the plurality of computing devices (col.6 lines 20-32).

As for claims 7 and 13, Rothermel teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said

policies are security polices regarding user access to each of the plurality of computing

devices. (col. 11 lines 1-45)

As for claim 8, Rothermel teaches a system for automatically provisioning a

plurality of computing devices in accordance with established policies, the system

comprising: a database system which stores a plurality of templates which reflect said

polices (col.6 lines 56-60), a plurality of agents which are respectively resident on each

of said plurality of computing devices (col. 5 lines 30-40), and which communicate with

said database system to obtain information with regard to provisioning and maintenance

of the respective computing devices (col. 5 lines 30-40), and a communications gateway

through which communication messages are exchanged between said agents and said

database system (col. 5 lines 1-12: Supervisor devices), wherein said communications

gateway is configured to: retrieve the individual ones of the plurality of templates,

expand the plurality of retrieved templates to create respective documents containing

combined template information and expanded information, and provided the documents

containing the combined template information and expanded information to said plurality

of agents (col.4 lines 49 thru 67).

As for claim 14, Rothermel teaches the system of claim 8, wherein at least one

template includes a reference to information external to the template, and wherein said

communication gateway expands the template by creating a document that includes

information contained in the template and said external information. (fig. 3B items 30, 311, 316).

As for claim 16, Rothermel teaches the system of claim 14 wherein said external information comprises a list of users (col. 11 lines 18-30).

As for claim 17, Rothermel teaches the system of claim 9 wherein said communications gateway expands a template to include information contained in a conditional statement only if the computing device to which said expanded information is to be provided meets the condition (col. 11 lines 35-40).

As for claim 18, Rothermel teaches the method of claim 1, wherein at least one template includes a reference to information external to the template, and wherein said expanding step comprises creating a document that includes information contained in the template and said external information (col. 11 lines 18-30).

As for claim 20, Rothermel teaches the method of claim 18, wherein said external information comprises a list of users (col. 11 lines 18-30).

As for claim 21, Rothermel teaches the method of claim 3, wherein said expanding step includes the step of including information contained in a conditional

statement only if the computing device to which said expanded information is to be

provided meets the condition (col. 11 lines 18-30).

As for claims 22, 24-31, and 33-36, the claims are directed to the same method

as found in claims 1-14, 16-18, 20 and 21 in slightly reworded form. Therefore these

claims are rejected on the same basis as are claims 1-14, 16-18, 20 and 21.

Allowable Subject Matter

5.   Claims 15, 19, 23, and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Paul Callahan/
April 11, 2008

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137